



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE
PRIMEVAL LANGUAGE OF MANKIND.

BY RICHARD KIRWAN, ESQ. L.L.D. P.R.I.A. &c. &c. &c.



READ, NOV. 4TH, 1805.

THE origin of vocal language, that combination of sounds, by which the thoughts and sentiments of men are communicated to each other, thus forming the principal link of their social intercourse, has always excited the astonishment of those who have attended to its investigation.

On this subject, two opinions have been proposed. The first was held, or rather suspected, by persons unacquainted with the most ancient and authentic record of the origin of our species. They supposed, that men originally lived in a savage unconnected state, destitute of any language; that their mutual wants and dangers induced them at last to unite; and, that by uttering different sounds, as often as they pointed at different objects, they gradually formed a language. Thus its origin is explained by Diodorus,* and by Lucretius.†

VOL. X.

Q

At

* Lib. I. cap. iii.

† Lib. V. v. 1027, &c.

At varios linguæ sonitus natura subegit
Mittere, et utilitas expressit nomina rerum.

And again,

Postremo quid in hoc mirabile tantopere est,
Si genus humanum, cui vox et lingua vigerit,
Pro vario sensu, varias res voce notaret.

But we are surprised to see so eminent a critic as P. Simon,* agree with these unenlightened heathens, and abandon, without any necessity, and in opposition to all just rules of interpretation, the literal sense of the second chapter of Genesis; in which, language is expressly mentioned as co-existing with the first pair. Even the celebrated Warburton, though he expressly deduces the origin of language from inspiration, appears to me to have been too liberal in allowing the possibility of any other origin.† Its impossibility has been demonstrated, both theoretically, by the subtle and eloquent Rousseau;‡ and experimentally, in the person of the savage of Aveyron. Among many curious observations, of which he was the object, it was discovered, not only that the organs of speech grow torpid by inaction, and can, with great difficulty, utter any articulate sound; but, what was still more extraordinary, this savage was, with equal difficulty, taught to connect those

* Hist. Crit. du Vieux Testam. Lib. I. chap. xiv. et xv.

† Divine Legation, Book IV. §. iv. p. 106, in 8vo.

‡ Sur l'Inégalité, &c.

those he was enabled to produce, with the objects presented to him, as signs to denote them. The Chinese cannot pronounce the letters B, D, R, X; because, not being in their language, they were not taught, in their infancy, to utter the sounds annexed to them.

The second opinion, therefore, namely, that the gift of speech was originally bestowed on our first parents, by the great Author of their existence, is the only one which can, with any appearance of reason, be entertained; and is confirmed by the Mosaic history of the origin of our species. It fully proves, that the power of communicating their thoughts to each other, was possessed by our first parents, and coeval with their existence.*

That the language, thus imparted to man, possessed, at its origin, that degree of perfection which it afterwards attained, is a supposition neither necessary nor analogous to the usual conduct of Divine Providence. The designs of Providence would be sufficiently answered, by inspiring such sounds, and suggesting the knowledge of their signification, as denoted the objects with which they were necessarily conversant; such as the names of the various animals, which they were instructed to use or to avoid; and the relations which they themselves stood in, with respect to each other. Accordingly we find, that Moses, notwithstanding

Q 2

standing

* See the learned notes of Dr. Magee, in his Discourse on the Scriptural Doctrine of Atonement, p. 300, &c.

standing his usual attention to brevity, does not fail to mention both these circumstances. Gen. chap. ii.

On this foundation, further improvements might afterwards have been superstructed, either by the invention of new names for new objects, or by devising such modifications, as should render the expression and discrimination of the relations of objects to each other more precise and accurate, during the long space of time that intervened between the Creation and the Flood.*

The primeval language must have been, at first, monosyllabic, or, at least, dissyllabic; these being the simplest enunciations: but, soon after, it, for the most part, assumed this last form, or became more compound; these forms being the most convenient for expressing the different relations, which objects bear to each other, and to the various modifications of existence, action, passion, and adjacent circumstances; as such relations may be denoted by the variations of the terminating syllables. This mode of signifying relations, is much more natural than that employed in many ancient and modern languages; and, therefore, must have preceded it. For, as a profound philosopher, the celebrated Adam Smith, hath well observed, to express a relation in this “manner, did not require any “effort of abstraction. It was not expressed, as in the
“languages

* 2256 years, by Mr. Jackson's chronology, which I adopt. It differs little from the Septuagint.

“ languages alluded to, by a peculiar word, denoting
 “ relation, and nothing but relation, but by a simple va-
 “ riation of the correlative term. It was expressed, as it
 “ appears in nature; and not as something separate and
 “ detached, (as by our particles *of*, *to*, *from*, &c.) but as
 “ mixed and blended with the correlative object.”

The relations of verbs, to person, number, and time, whether stated as actual or possible, or under the modifications of interrogation, command, or velleity, are still more complex; and must have been, with less effort of abstraction, denoted by variations or additions to the radical term, than by any words or abstract signs of such relations; such as are employed in languages of posterior origin.

Numbers, while mankind, and all animals, existed only in pairs, would naturally be marked by terminations, which denoted one individual, or both: and, hence, the dual number must have preceded the plural, which was denoted only when more than two were brought into existence.

In the same manner, the sexes, and inanimate objects, must have been originally distinguished by the termination of their appellations; but the latter, being of no sex, and having, in their different classes, a strong resemblance to each other, were naturally considered as an unit, or a single object.

During the life of Adam, various arts were invented; as that of agriculture, that of metallurgy, and also architecture, (as cities were built,) and many more, which these
 presuppose;

presuppose; consequently, the sphere of language was much enlarged, many new radicals being invented.

The numbers of mankind must have prodigiously increased, long before the death of Adam; for it is ridiculous to think that he had no more than three sons, or that they had not attained the age of puberty, at the same period that men do at present. He must have had many more sons, as well as daughters, though none are mentioned by Moses; as he intended tracing little more than the pedigree of Noah, and the remote and immediate causes of the Flood.

Cain, when sentence of banishment was pronounced against him, apprehending he might be put to death by some of his brethren, retired to a considerable distance from them; and his family, having little or no intercourse with the remaining descendants of Adam, for many ages, it is highly probable, that, in his family, the primitive language was gradually altered: at least, it could not receive the improvements, which that, more favoured by Adam, had received. In this, peace was preserved, at least during the life of Adam; but, in the family of Cain, crimes of every kind appear to have been committed; in so much, that, in the days of Enos, the grandson of Adam, the descendants of Seth, and probably many more, who formed the community in which Adam resided, were distinguished from the family of Cain, by the honorable appellation of *Sons of God*. But, in process of time, when both families had multiplied to a great degree, and the
earth

earth had been fully peopled, both unfortunately intermixed with each other; and, as it frequently happens, the wicked seduced the good, contention soon arose, legitimate governments were subverted; war, violence, conquest, or anarchy, every where prevailed; nor was even the presence of God, which was long, at least occasionally, manifested to Adam, and his favoured family, and emphatically called the *Spirit of God*, sufficient to repress these disorders. Hence, the necessity of destroying the whole race, all to one family, namely, that of Noah.

It is not necessary to suppose, that the whole range of the primitive language was known to Noah or his family; but its structure, its idioms, and radical words, might be retained by them; and several books, written in that language, were certainly preserved by them, as will be seen in the sequel.

Thus this language subsisted, as we are informed by Moses, for some generations, (about five hundred years,) among the greater part of the descendants of Noah; not but other languages might have arisen, during that interval, among other families, sprung from banished criminals, as before the Flood. But these, formed without any preconcerted plan, in the intercourse of a turbulent and ignorant multitude, could be nothing more than uncouth jargons, as defective, and ill connected, as those of the lowest ranks of society, in all countries, generally are. The practice of punishing the most atrocious crimes, by banishment,

nishment, was, anciently, the most usual:* and, in those early ages, such crimes were very frequent.† Each new criminal, with his family, resorting to those of a similar description, soon forgot his native language, and adopted that of the tribe with which his family had been incorporated. How soon a language, spoken by comparatively few families, is lost in that of the society to which they are aggregated, appears, in many instances. The Jews lost theirs, at Babylon, in about seventy years; and Barrow, in his highly entertaining and instructive account of China,‡ tells us, the French refugees, at the Cape of Good Hope, lost theirs in less than seventy years: and so it must ever happen, when communication with the parent stock is not frequent and easy. Even at present, the English language has undergone some variation in America.

But the great and sudden transition, from the primeval language to a multitude of heterogeneous languages, happened, as Moses relates, several centuries after the Flood, in the plains of Shinaar. Immediately after that catastrophe, the children of Noah were ordered to people the earth: for this purpose, it was necessary they should separate. But, having antecedently associated the idea of separation with that of exile, they long persisted in remaining

* See Le Clerc, in Genes. iv. 2. Diodorus, Lib. III. cap. iv. 2 Goguet, 236. Grotius, in Matth. V. p. 68.

† Thucyd. Lib. I. c. v.

‡ Page 425.

maining together; and, after passing several years in the Eastern regions, they removed, in a body, to the Western. They lived in tents, and led a pastoral life; as appears by the ninth chapter of Genesis: if they had cultivated any tracts, they, most probably, would have been attached to them. The example of Noah, who was an agriculturist, does not seem to have been followed by his posterity. The culture of vines (from the misfortune which their product had occasioned, and the curse, entailed on some of them, originating from it, and, possibly, the recollection, that Cain, the agriculturist, must have been drunk, when he killed his brother,) appears to have been neglected, for several ages; for its discovery, in after times, was highly celebrated: and, to this day, the use of any intoxicating liquor is interdicted to the four casts of the Hindoos;* nor do I find it mentioned in any account of China.

Charmed with the fertility of the Babylonian plains, they seemed to have designed to proceed no farther, but resolved to erect a tower, as high as possible, as a signal, by which their situation, in distant rambles, might, at all times, be determined. It was, however, evident, that, extensive as these plains were, their products would, at last, be insufficient for the maintenance of such multitudes, as they must, in process of time, amount to; whence numberless disorders would have arisen. The gentlest method of forcing them to separate was employed. Their different

VOL. X.

R

tribes,

* Indian Recreations, Vol. II. p. 284.

tribes, and their subdivisions, were rendered unintelligible to each other, by obliterating the memory of their ancient language, and substituting, in its stead, new sounds, different in each tribe, and intelligible only to those that composed it; or altering the signification of the primitive sounds. It is not necessary to suppose, that all these tribes lost their original language; the views of Providence would equally be attained, if it subsisted in one tribe only, or one fraction thereof.

To estimate the degree of perfection, which language must have attained before the Flood, it will be proper to examine, what degree of knowledge men must have possessed some ages before that catastrophe.

Among the proofs of antediluvian knowledge still existing, the most incontestible are, the astronomical tables of the Bramins; and particularly those of Tirvalore, discovered by Mr. Gentil, about the middle of the last century. Their epoch coincides with the famous æra of the Calyougham, that is, with the year 3102 before Christ: and this æra must have been ascertained by observation; as Mr. Playfair shews, after a strict and masterly examination, in the second volume of the Edinburgh Transactions. And, if founded on preceding observations, as is most probable, these observations must have commenced 1200 years earlier, that is, 4300 years before Christ.* The Deluge happened

* I am aware, that the conclusions, deduced by Mr. Playfair, have lately been combated, in the sixth volume of the Asiatic Researches; but, in my opinion, ineffectually.

pened 3169 years before the birth of Christ, according to Jackson's chronology, (which I adopt); therefore, the Calyougham commenced sixty-seven years after the Flood; and the observations, on which it was grounded, commenced 1133 years before the Flood: which agrees remarkably well with the tradition of the Jews; for Josephus expressly mentions, that the children of Seth addicted themselves to astronomy before the Flood.*

The learned Professor farther adds, that the construction of these tables implies a great knowledge of geometry, arithmetic, and even of the theoretic parts of astronomy; that those who framed them must have possessed a calculus equivalent to trigonometry; and that, upon the whole, it appears there existed, at that period, a body of science really astonishing.

That such a body of science could exist, and be communicated to subsequent ages, without the art of writing, is incredible: yet these tables afford a sufficient proof, that astronomical science, at least, had so descended, and were, consequently, written. It may also be inferred, that alphabetic writing had been known before the Flood; for the Sanscrit writing, in which these tables exist, is alphabetic; and into this their original language was soon translated. Moses also informs us, that a written account (or rather history) of the descendants of Adam existed; from this he transcribed, in the fifth chapter of Genesis, the

R 2

names

names of the ancestors of Noah. But it certainly contained much more, and related the most important transactions of the antediluvian ages; for St. Peter expressly tells us, Noah preached repentance to the antediluvians, 120 years before the Flood; a circumstance unnoticed by Moses.*

While science was thus improved, we may conclude language received similar improvements; as we have always seen its progress to perfection to keep pace with that of knowledge: it certainly did so, among the Romans; and still more obviously, in modern times. Among the Greeks, indeed, a singular exception occurred; as the perfection of their language long preceded their improvements in science; the reason of which will soon be seen. When, therefore, we consider the length of time the primeval language had been spoken, namely, by the lowest computation, 1300 years, and, more probably, 2000; the longevity of those who spoke it, the few generations that succeeded one another, during that period, not more than four, and the consequent stability it must have acquired; it being impossible to suppose it much altered, during so short a transmission; the undisturbed state in which the more favoured descendants of Adam remained, during the greater part of that interval; we have sufficient reason to conclude, that this language attained a far higher degree of perfection, than any subsequent language, that could
not

* 1 Peter, iii. 20.

not enjoy the same advantages, was enabled, by any possibility, to acquire.

Three things are indispensably necessary to the perfection of a language: 1st, That it should be capable of expressing, with energy and precision, and, consequently, without any ambiguity, all the various objects, which the senses may present, the understanding define, the imagination depict, and the different shades and modifications of the invisible passions and sentiments which actuate the human breast.

2^{dly}, That melody should exist in the prolation of its sounds, and, under the direction of genius, in the structure of its periods, their cadence, and versification.

3^{dly}, That its construction should be so unfettered, that its designation of relations should not require any particular fixed situation, but be capable, without ambiguity, of all that variety of position, which melody, either in prose or verse, may require.

Having thus ascertained in what the perfection of a language consists, and the probability that it may justly be ascribed to the primitive language; and having also indicated the distinctive characters by which, if it still exists, it may yet be recognized, I now proceed to examine, whether they apply to any, or to which, of the most ancient languages now known to us; being furnished with *criteria*, by which their respective pretensions may be decided.

The principal languages, whose claims have hitherto been severally insisted upon, are, the Hebrew, the Egyptian,
the

the Chinese, and the Greek; though the claim of this last has, as far as I can find, found only one advocate, namely, John Erick, a German professor; whose proofs, being chiefly drawn from distorted etymologies, were, by others, treated with the utmost contempt.*

OF THE HEBREW

THE first distinctive character of the primeval language, namely, the most natural designation of the relations of nouns, is not found in the Hebrew. Mr. Wilson, in his *Hebrew Grammar*,† (the best and easiest I have seen,) tells us, “that nice attention to the changes of termination, so requisite in acquiring the knowledge of other ancient languages, has here no existence; the relations and dependencies of nouns, are not distinguished by terminations or cases, but by particles or prepositions prefixed.” These, it is true, are also incorporated with the word, but not only they are general, but they indicate the relation in the most clumsy manner; for it is often difficult to distinguish, whether they form the radical, or only denote its relation, which, Mr. Wilson acknowledges, is very apt to perplex the learner, “as he must strip the noun of these signs, before the primitive form can appear.”‡

The

* See Michaeler, de Origine Linguæ primaria, p. 300.

† P. 108.

‡ P. 116.

The comparison of adjectives is performed in the same awkward manner; and is often so ambiguous, as to be unintelligible.* The superlative is formed, in the most inartificial and infantine manner, by a mere repetition of the positive.

Nouns have but two genders, the masculine and feminine; thus inanimate things are not distinguished from the animate: just so the vulgar, among us, frequently express themselves. Probably this defect was productive of idolatry.

There is no dual in the Hebrew, except when things, which are naturally double, are mentioned; as, the eyes, the ears, the hands, &c. (hence, also, it never occurs in the New Testament). Wilson, indeed, does not make even this exception; but I find it mentioned by Bythner,† and Amama.‡ Here, also, it differs from the primeval language: in many instances, the singular and plural coincide, and can be distinguished only by the sense, or other words in the sentence.§

Lastly, in verbs, neither persons, moods or tenses, are marked by the changes of their last syllables; but by means of letters of a particular order, which appear, sometimes in the beginning, sometimes in the middle, and sometimes at the end of the original word. Another wide departure from the original language.¶

From

* For instance, in Gen. x. 21.

¶ Wilson, 149.

† P. 18.

§ Id. p. 109.

‡ P. 24.

From these, and many other inherent defects, the learned Le Clerc, himself a professor of the Hebrew language, declares, that perhaps no language is fuller of ambiguity and obscurity.* Can such be the language polished and improved for twenty centuries?

To this our late pious and learned Primate, Newcome, answers, that the difficulties, respecting these and other modifications of the Hebrew verb, are considerable, but not invincible; that it is true, that the substitutions of one gender, number or person, for others, are bold and frequent, but not inexplicable.† As much may be said of the jargon, spoken by the English in the days of Henry III.; or in France, during the reign of Lewis IX.

The advocates of the Hebrew found its claim chiefly on the two following grounds.

1st, That many or all the antediluvian names are significant, in the Hebrew language, and derivable from it. But the learned Mr. Lanigan, lately Scriptural Professor in the University of Pavia, in the first volume of his Biblical Institutions, observes, that these names are as easily derivable from the Chaldaic or Syriac, and still more easily from the Arabic. Grotius, Huet, and Le Clerc think, that the real antediluvian names were translated into the Hebrew; and they give many instances of similar translations: thus the translator of Sanchoniatho into Greek, calls Adam, *Protogon*. Mr. Lanigan, indeed, thinks, that many of them cannot

* Preliminary Discourse to the Pentat. §. 6.

† Preface to Ezechiel, p. xxxiv. and xxxv.

cannot be deemed translations; as their derivation from the Hebrew is forced and wiredrawn. It follows, then, that they are not of Hebrew origin. We have no reason to suppose, that Moses was acquainted with the antediluvian language: he found those names in his family-memoirs; and derived them, as he could, from the Hebrew, or from the Arabic, which he well understood. Of such names, our learned Professor mentions four, Cain, Tubal Cain, Noah, and Babel: the true derivation of these, and some others, I shall soon have occasion to mention. Le Clerc thinks, that many of these names were given, not at the time of the births of the Patriarchs, but were rather by-names, derived from some remarkable event, that happened in their time. And, indeed, this is evident, with respect to Phaleg or Peleg; as Moses expressly tells us, he was so called, because, in his time, the earth was divided between the descendants of Noah. Genes. x. 25.

The second ground, on which the advocates for the Hebrew rest its claim, is, that a number of words, of Hebraic origin, are found in many other ancient languages; as the Chaldaic, Syriac, Phœnician, and Persian. These, they think, are remnants of the ancient primeval language; and, since these are also Hebrew, they think that language must also be the Hebrew. But this mixture of Hebrew words, in those languages, is easily accounted for. It is now generally allowed, that the Phœnician, Canaanitish, and Hebrew, were one and the same language. The Phœnicians traded to all nations, and must have left them many

words; as the French do with us at this day. The Medes, Persians, and other Eastern nations, may have received many more, from the Israelites dispersed among them. So the Greek colony, established at Marseilles, it is well known, communicated many words, which still remain in the French language.

After what has been said of the ambiguity of this language, it is needless to mention its uncouth guttural sounds, its unsusceptibility of the varieties of position, and other marks of imperfection.

THE EGYPTIAN.

THIS language exhibits the same defects as the Hebrew, and still greater. The Copts neither decline their nouns, nor conjugate their verbs, otherwise than by prefixing particles, sometimes of one or more syllables, and sometimes a single letter, which denote the case, gender, number, and person; several of them being joined together in one word, and the primitive word usually placed last. So that the difficulty of their language consists, in the incredible combination of the words and particles, in the change of the vowels, in transposing the middle parts of the words, and adding superfluous letters, to distinguish which requires great labour and skill.*

THE

* Wilkins, *De Lingua Coptica*, 1 Univers. Hist. fol 6, p. 226.

THE CHINESE.

OF the Chinese language, a very satisfactory account has been given, by our late accomplished and intelligent travellers, Sir George Staunton, and Mr. Barrow. The construction of this language, Mr. Barrow* tells us, is extremely simple: it admits of no inflection of termination, either in the verb, or in the noun; each word being the same invariable monosyllable, in number, gender, case, or tense. The cases they distinguish, by general abstract signs, as we do in English; which, alone, as already seen, plainly shews this could not be the original language of mankind; men never beginning by abstractions. Comparison is also made by adventitious particles; and the superlative is marked, in the same awkward manner as in Hebrew, by a repetition of the positive: the tenses of verbs, of which there are only three, are also distinguished by abstract particles. Sir George, indeed, thinks, that this language furnishes a practical proof, that the laborious structure, and intricate machinery, of the Greek and Arabic tongues, are by no means necessary, either to a complete communication on all the business of life, or even to the grace of elocution, or the harmony of verse.

s 2

I am

* P. 264

I am much disposed to entertain a different opinion, on each of these particulars. There are many shades and discriminations of verbs, which cannot be indicated by particles, suggesting the difference of time merely in the gross. The difference between definite and indefinite time is lost; and thus all pretensions to precision, the principal excellence, and the most necessary of all the qualifications of language, are abandoned. Indeed, of all known languages, spoken by a civilized nation, the Chinese hath the smallest pretension to precision. Every word has, at least, twenty different significations, besides the different aspirations; and these significations are only distinguished, by the difference of tone or accent; to perceive which, Sir George acknowledges, requires a nice ear and delicate vocal powers, to render them exactly. How the grace of elocution, and the harmony of verse, can subsist, in such a confusion of discordant sounds, I am at a loss to conjecture: yet, even this contrivance is not always sufficient, to express the sense of a word; recourse must be had to the ultimate *criterion*, tracing with the finger, in the air, or otherwise, the form of the written character of the doubtful sound. Such a language is, no doubt, very simple; but so is the *Lingua Franca*, which, in many respects, resembles it, but whose perfection, I suppose, nobody will vaunt. Of this similarity, Mr. Barrow gives some examples, page 281, and Sir G. Staunton, page 418, (in 8vo.). Adam Smith justly remarks, “ that the simplification of the rudiments of languages renders them more imperfect, and less proper,
“ for

“ for the purposes of language: for, if precision be re-
 “ quired, (which, indeed, the Chinese does not aim at,)
 “ such languages become more prolix; several words being
 “ necessary to express what might have been expressed by
 “ a single word. Thus, the words *Dei*, and *Deo*, in Latin,
 “ sufficiently shew, without any addition, what relation the
 “ object signified is understood to stand in, to the objects
 “ expressed by the other words in the sentence; whereas,
 “ in English, and other modern languages, we must em-
 “ ploy, at least, two words, and say, *of God, to God*,
 “ and sometimes four; for the single word *amavissem*, we
 “ must say, *I would have loved*. This prolixity evidently
 “ enervates the eloquence of most modern languages.”
 Dr. James Gregory adds, that “ the moods of verbs, like
 “ other inflections of words, express, much better than any
 “ *succession* of words can do, the intimate connexion and
 “ relation of various thoughts, which are not successive,
 “ but simultaneous, or co-existent, and which appear un-
 “ naturally disjointed, and, in some measure altered, when
 “ they are expressed by a series of words, denoting each
 “ of them separately, and in succession.”*

2^{dly}. This simplification of the principles of languages,
 renders them less agreeable to the ear: the variety of ter-
 mination in the Greek and Latin, occasioned by their de-
 clensions and conjugations, gives a sweetness to their lan-
 guage, altogether unknown to any modern language.

3^{dly}. This

* 2 Edinb. Trans. p. 216.

3^{dy}. This simplification not only renders the sounds of our language less agreeable to the ear, but it also restrains us from disposing the sounds in the manner that might be the most agreeable; tying down words to a particular situation, and forbidding almost every kind of inversion or transposition.

THE GREEK.

IN this, and this only, most of the characters of the primeval language are found. It is perfectly original, being underived, in the opinion of the most profound antiquarian and ablest linguist of the last century,* from any other Oriental language, with the exception of a few words, borrowed from the Phœnicians, Thracians, and Scythians; and in its structure, it totally differs from all of them.

In this, the relation of nouns to each other, and of verbs to time, person, and number, are denoted in the most natural manner, and with the greatest precision and accuracy, by mere changes of, or additions to, the termination.

It is equally happy, in expressing every modification of perception, passion and emotion, which may arise in, occupy, or agitate the human mind.

The dual number, in all cases, it almost exclusively possesses. Adam Smith, from misinformation, conceived
this

* Hemsterhusius; see the French translation of Herodotus, Vol. I. p. 276.

this number to exist in the Slavonic, and in other Oriental tongues. In the Swedish it certainly exists, and in languages derived from it; as the Anglo-Saxon and Islandic: but the Swedes borrowed it from the Goths, who long resided in Thrace, and derived it from the neighbouring Macedonians, who certainly spoke a Greek dialect, though corrupt. In the Anglo-Saxon, and Islandic, the dual is retained only in the pronouns; as the great Swedish antiquarian, Ihre, assures us. He denies it to be found in the Slavonic, or any other Oriental dialect, with which he was acquainted.

The plural number of nouns of the neuter gender, being originally considered, from their similarity to each other, as one object, admitted a construction with verbs in the singular number: a mode of construction, which was afterwards unwarrantably abused. Even animated beings, considered merely as *things*, were often expressed by neutral nouns.

Again, if we examine the degree of perfection, which the Greek attained, and still exhibits, we shall find it acknowledged, by the best judges, to exceed that which any other known language has ever reached. In proof of a fact, so well known, it is needless to accumulate authorities; one alone, of perhaps the ablest judge of the delicacies of expression, that has appeared in the last century, will be sufficient. It may easily be perceived I mean the celebrated Voltaire. Of the Greek, he thus speaks:

“ The

“ The most perfect of all languages must be that, which
 “ is, at once, the most complete, the most sonorous, the
 “ most varied in its modes of expression, and the most
 “ regular in its arrangement; which has most of compound
 “ words, whose prosody best expresses the slow or impe-
 “ tuous emotions of the mind; and whose sounds are most
 “ musical. The Greek possesses all these advantages: it
 “ has not the rudeness of the Latin; of which so many
 “ words end in *um*, *ur*, *us*. It has all the pomp of the
 “ Spanish, and all the sweetness of the Italian; and, by
 “ its long and short syllables, it is superior, in musical
 “ expression, to all living languages: so that, even disfi-
 “ gured as it is, at this day, in Greece, it may still be re-
 “ garded as the most beautiful language in the universe.”

Now, if we compare the degree of excellence, which
 this language attained, in the earliest ages after the Flood,
 with the state of civilization of those who spoke it in those
 ages, we shall find the utmost disproportion betwixt them;
 the inverse of what happened in any other age or country.
 Homer wrote 940 years before the Christian æra, when
 Greece was far from being thoroughly civilized; yet, in
 him, it is acknowledged, the Greek language appears, as
 polished and refined as in Sophocles, Euripides, or even
 Demosthenes, who wrote in the most civilized periods.
 And, if we pierce higher into antiquity, we find Linus,
 who lived 1500 years before Christ, and 300 years before
 the Trojan war, and his disciple, the first Orpheus, both
 so much admired, that the former, in subsequent ages,

was

was thought the son of a muse; and the latter, of Apollo. Museus wrote a poem, called *The Rape of Proserpine*, 1400 years before Christ, according to the *Parian Marbles*.* Tatian, who flourished in the second century, mentions many other poets, who preceded Homer.† Nor were there barely poets, but also many historians, before Homer; as Corinnus, Dictys Cretensis, &c. who wrote immediately after the Trojan war; and, consequently, nearly 1200 years before Christ.‡ But, if we attend to the state of society, at the times of Linus and Orpheus, we shall find it highly barbarous, by the avowal of the most credible Greek historians themselves; and scarcely improved, in the age that immediately preceded the siege of Troy, and called the Heroic.

Thucydides, who wrote about 410 years before Christ, tells us,|| that, in the earliest times, Greece enjoyed little or no repose. The various tribes, that inhabited it, had no intercourse with each other: the stronger continually expelled the weaker from the more fertile parts; these sought refuge in the territory of Attica, which, being the most barren, was, at first, thinly inhabited; but, from these new accessions, became very populous. Yet, its inhabitants did not form a political union with each other, nor had any common laws, before the reign of Cecrops, about

VOL. X.

T

the

* See the Appendix to Playfair's Chronology.

† Euseb. Prepart. Evang. Lib. X. cap. ii.

‡ Voss. de Hist. Græcis, Lib. IV. cap. i. p. 422.

|| Lib. I. cap. ii. Apollodor. Lib. III.

the year 1556 before Christ.* In the ages, called Heroic, robbery and piracy were universally practised; the law of the strongest was almost the only one which they acknowledged, and openly avowed.† After the siege of Troy, almost all the cities of Greece were disturbed by seditions; and the return of the Heraclidæ, eighty years after that siege, occasioned new commotions: in so much, that many years elapsed before peace was restored.‡ This universal fermentation forced many to migrate to Asia, and join their countrymen, long established in Ionia, Æolia, and Doris: yet it was in this tempestuous period, that Homer was born and flourished. It does not appear, that any, either in that, or the preceding ages, applied themselves to the improvement of their mother tongue; neither, were it requisite, would their ignorance or circumstances permit them to effect it. When, then, did it attain, or from what source did it derive, the excellence it possessed in the most barbarous ages?

This forms a paradox, which can be solved, only, by supposing, that it originally descended to the Ionic race, from the earliest ages, in the same, or rather in a far superior degree of perfection; for, during that transmission, it, probably, contracted those defects, which may be observed in the earliest compositions that we now possess.||

To

* 2 Goguet, 16, 17, 18.

† Thucyd. Lib. I. cap. v. Plutarch. *Theseus*.

‡ Thucyd. Lib. I. cap. xii.

|| Mr. Mitford tells us, “ no circumstance, in the history of the Grecian people, appears more difficult to account for, even in conjecture, than the
“ extraordinary

To explain, more particularly, how this transmission was effected, we must recur to the information conveyed to us in the Sacred History; and to a few facts, which occur, also, in the profane.

Moses relates, that Noah had three sons, who survived the Deluge, Sem, Cham, and Japhet. Though Japhet is the last named, yet it appears that he was the eldest of the three, in the judgment of the most judicious commentators; of whom I need name no other, than Bishop Usher, and Le Clerc.

531 years after the Deluge, a multiplicity of languages was supernaturally introduced. During the period, that intervened betwixt the Flood and this event, the posterity of Noah became very numerous. Japhet had seven sons, Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, (or Jon,) Thubal, Mosoch, and Thiras. Javan, in whose line the Greek tongue descended, had four sons, Elisah, Tharsis, Chittim, and Do-

T 2

danim.

“ extraordinary superiority of form and polish, which their speech attained,
 “ in an age beyond tradition, and in circumstances apparently most unfavourable. For it was amid continual migrations, expulsions, mixtures of
 “ various hordes, and revolutions of every kind, the most unquestionable
 “ circumstances of early Grecian history, that was formed that language, so
 “ simple in its analogy; of such complex art, in its composition and inflection; of such clearness, force, and elegance, in its contexture; and of
 “ such singular sweetness, variety, harmony, and majesty, in its sounds. Already, in the time of Homer and Hesiod, who lived long before writing
 “ was common, we find it in full possession of these perfections,” &c.
 Vol. I. p. 83 and 84.

danim. Sem and Cham had also several sons and grandsons, whose names need not be mentioned; but it may not be amiss to observe, that the languages, spoken after the confusion, by the peculiar descendants of each of the three original Patriarchs, differed more widely, from those spoken by the descendants of the other two Patriarchs, than the languages, spoken by the descendants of each, differed from each other. Thus, the languages, spoken by the descendants of Japhet, differed more, from those spoken by the descendants of Sem or Cham, than the Japhetic languages did from each other. A difference, also, with each other, but in a lesser degree, betwixt the languages, spoken by the immediate descendants of each of the sons of the same Patriarch, may be observed. Thus, a difference may be observed, betwixt the languages, spoken by the sons of Gomer, and those spoken by the sons of Javan. But the difference, betwixt the languages spoken by the descendants of each of these sons, for instance, of each of the four sons of Javan, is the smallest of all; as some communication, betwixt persons so nearly connected, would be suffered to subsist. Thus, the language of the Mantchoo Tartars, descendants from Magog, is, as we are informed by Mr. Barrow, and Monsieur l'Eveque, rich, sonorous, and energetic; and more like the Greek, than any of the Oriental languages. It is alphabetic, or, more properly speaking, syllabic; and the different parts of speech are susceptible of expressing number, case, gender, time, modes

modes of action, passion, &c. by change of termination, preposition, or interposition.*

The posterity of Javan gradually descended from the plains of Shinaar, to the opposite coasts of Lesser Asia, on the Egean sea; and, from them, the whole country was denominated *Ionian*; as Josephus attests, *Antiq. Lib. I. cap. 6*. But, in process of time, they grew too numerous to remain together; and, being also pressed upon by the neighbouring barbarians, they passed into many of the islands of the Egean sea, and thence into Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, and Epire. Moses expressly tells us, that the islands of the nations were peopled by them. *Genesis, x. 4*. And
not

* Barrow's *Travels in China*, 270. L'Eveque, *Hist. Russ.* Vol. VI. p. 282. The difference of languages consists, either in the difference of *sounds*, denoting the same object, or of *constitution*, or of *utterance*. The same sounds may differ in *tone*, or *duration*; or in the abundance or defect of *vowels*, their arrangement and aspiration. The difference of *constitution* consists, in the various methods by which relations are indicated; namely, by abstract signs, *præfixes*, interposition, alteration of termination, or the order of position. The difference of *utterance* arises, from the difference of the organs by which the sounds are principally emitted; as, the guttural, the oral, and the nasal. The *oral* is either palatal, dental, sibilant, or labial. Those, that agree in the signification of a great number of words, and have a similar fundamental constitution, or nearly so, are, more or less remote, *kindred* languages, and frequently hybrid, at least, one of them is often so; as, the English and German; the French, Spanish, and Italian: the three last are certainly mixed or hybrid languages. When the radical words agree in signification, and have the same, or nearly the same constitution, but differ only in termination or utterance, they are called *dialects* of the same common language. Thus, the affinity or discrepance of languages, even their pedigree, may often be traced, even when history is silent.

not only islands, strictly so called, are to be understood by that name, but Greece itself; for, being much intersected by the sea, it was, in a loose sense, susceptible of that appellation.* Tharsis appears to have passed into Thrace,† Chittim into Macedonia. This is solidly proved by Le Clerc.‡ The author of the book of Maccabees expressly says, Alexander came from the land of Chittim, cap. i. 1. Dodanim seems to have passed into Epire.

From the invective of Alexander against Philotas,|| one would be apt to imagine the Macedonian language was different from the Greek; but it is evident, from Philotas's reply, that the Macedonians understood it, and that Alexander himself addressed the army in Greek. It was, certainly, the language, introduced by Ptolemy into Egypt; and exclusively spoken in the court of his successors.§ However, from a mixture of several barbarian nations, the Macedonian dialect was much debased: besides, as already noticed, some difference occurred in the languages spoken by the families descended from the different sons of Javan.

The Thracians and Epirots, being still more exposed to the inroads of the neighbouring barbarians, many of whom settled among them, difficultly retained any traces of their original language; particularly the former. However, it was long retained in some parts of Thrace; as appears

by

* Greece is expressly so called, 1 Maccab. xi. 38.

† Le Clerc on Genes. x.

‡ Ibid.

|| Quint. Curtius, Lib. VI. cap. 28.

§ 7 L'Archer's Herodot. 72.

by the poems of Orpheus and Linus, composed in Greek. Pieria and Olympus were anciently parts of Thrace,* though they were afterwards accounted to belong to Macedonia:† from the prevailing mixture of barbarians, the Thracians were deemed to be also barbarians.‡

That Epire was also inhabited by Greeks, though intermixed with many barbarian tribes, appears by Strabo,|| who tells us, the Molossi, an Epirotic tribe, were governed by kings of the race of Æacus; as was afterwards all Epire by Pyrrhus. Besides, we find the Molossi sent a colony to Ionia: now the Ionians would certainly not have received them, if they were not of Greek origin. It is true, they also received the Pelasgic Arcadians; for this reason only, that the Pelasgi were incorporated with the Arcadians, and could not be distinguished, see Herodot. Lib. I. cap. cxlvi;§ as they were, also, with the Athenians. Plin. Lib. IV. cap. i. reckons Macedonia, Epire, and Thrace, as part of Greece; and so does Homer, Iliad II. v. 635.

The descendants of Elisah, the eldest son of Javan, passed into Greece, properly so called, extending from Macedonia, on the north, to the southern extremity of Peloponnesus; and from the Eastern to the Western sea, and the adjacent islands. Thus, we see the territories of
all

* Strabo, Lib. VII. p. 471.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid. Lib. VII. p. 321.

|| Ibid. Lib. VII. p. 324.

§ See 1 PArcher, Herod. 119, and the notes and 7 PArcher, 221. 231.

all the sons of Jon bordered on each other; and, I believe, it generally happened, that the progeny of *each* of the original patriarchs, Japhet, Sem, and Cham, settled at a great distance, from that of the other Patriarchs; but the progeny of *each* of the sons of the *same* Patriarch, for instance of Japhet, settled at a less considerable distance from each other; and the descendants of each of the grandsons, for instance the descendants from Javan, settled at a still less distance from each other.

Elisah, in the Samaritan copy, is written *Helas*;* and from him, after some ages, for reasons we shall presently mention, the Greeks were then called *Hellenes*. The Hellenes, then, not being permanently exposed to barbarians, as the other descendants of Jon were, preserved the Greek language unmixed. Greece, before the arrival of the Hellenes, was inhabited by various barbarian tribes; as Strabo informs us from Hecateus;† of whom the most powerful were the Pelasgi, who originally dwelled in the maritime parts, afterwards called Ionia.‡ Hence, it is plain, by the testimony of a profane historian also, that the descendants of Jon passed into Greece, from the continent of Lesser Asia, after they had expelled the Pelasgi, who inhabited the coasts afterwards called Ionia. The Pelasgi, thus expelled from Ionia, passed, probably, into the country, afterwards called Attica, as being nearest to them; but this
being

* See Newcome on Ezechiel, xxvii. 8.

† Lib. VII. p. 321.

‡ Strabo, Lib. XIII. 621, and Lib. V. 220, 221.

being barren, they settled, in greater numbers, in Peloponnesus, and founded the kingdoms of Sicyon and Argos: the former, 2171 years before Christ,* and the latter 1779.† Hence Ephorus, quoted by Strabo, says, Peloponnesus was anciently called Pelasgia;‡ and Æschylus, in *Supplices*, 598, 600, (or rather 327 and 350, in my edition); and Pliny, Lib. IV.

Who these Pelasgi were, it is difficult to discover: that they were originally Arcadians, I think improbable, though affirmed by Strabo. Arcadia, being a very small territory, could scarcely contain a tribe so numerous as the Pelasgi formed in these early ages: besides, it is an inland territory, and the Pelasgi always chose to inhabit the sea coasts; and hence, the part of Peloponnesus, which they inhabited, was often called Ægialea. Strabo, Lib. VIII. p. 384. It seems more probable, that they were the descendants of Chanaan, the son of Cham; and were those, who, as Herodotus relates, after wandering to the Red sea, settled at last in Phœnicia,|| Herodot. Lib. I. p. 1; whence they sent colonies into Greece, and the adjacent islands. He also says, Lib. II. §. 51, that, from the island of Samothrace,

VOL. X.
U
they

* 3 Jacks. 306; or 2164, according to 7 l'Archer's Herodot.; a very near agreement.

† 3 Jacks. 310 and 313; according to l'Archer, 1986 before Christ.

† Lib. V. 221.

¶ But the expedition, which he mentions, must have happened long after the settlement of the Pelasgi in Argos. See l'Archer's note thereon.

they passed into Attica. Now, Sanchoniatho informs us, that the Samothracians derived their origin from Sydoc, a Phœnician divinity;* that is, a divinised Phœnician. It is also certain, from Herodot. Lib. I. §. 57, that they spoke a barbarian language; and were barbarians, §. 58: were the most ancient inhabitants of Greece, Strabo, Lib. VII. 327: and had spread over all Greece, Ibid, Lib. V. 220. Their language, however, was not the Phœnician; else Herodotus would not have been at a loss to discover what it was; nor would Cadmus have expelled them from Bœotia. Hence, the conjecture of the very learned General Vallancey, that they were an Indo-Scythian nation, is not destitute of probability; and is supported by many respectable authorities.

The descendants of Hellas, who afterwards occupied all Greece, except Etolia and Acarnania, seem first to have landed in Attica, being the nearest part of the continent; and, from the name of their particular ancestor, they bestowed, on the interjacent rocky and deserted island, the name *Helene*. It is mentioned by Strabo, Lib. IX. 612, and Pausanias, p. 85: but the Greeks themselves could not know the reason of that appellation. On landing, they found the country inhabited, though thinly, on account of its barrenness, by two Pelasgian tribes, the Aones, and the Temnices. Many of these fled to the southern promontory of Sunium, where they are noticed by Strabo, p. 615; but

* Euseb. Prepar. Evang. Lib. I. cap. x. p. 36.

but many still remained, who submitted to the Hellenes, and were incorporated with them. The territory they thus possessed, they called *Ionia*; in memory of their primitive ancestor, and not from Jon, the son of Xuthus; as the Greeks themselves, in after ages, falsely imagined. Thus the testimonies of Herodotus and Strabo should be understood, consistently with each other, and with that of Josephus.

Herodotus, Lib. VIII. §. 44, tells us, that when the Pelasgi possessed the country, now called Greece, the Athenians (that is, the inhabitants of Attica) were Pelasgi; and were called Craneans. (from the roughness of the country); and Cecropidæ, under the reign of Cecrops; and Erechtheidæ, under that of Erechtheus; and from Jon, the general of their forces, they assumed the name of Ionians. And Strabo, Lib. IX. 608, adds, that Attica was called Mopsopia, from a great grandson of Cranaus. But these names were given only by poets; as Kuhnus has well remarked, in his notes on this passage. Thus, the Romans were called Romulidæ, by Virgil, *Æneid* VIII. 638: but this could not be called their general appellation. Mopsopus must have lived under Erectheus the second: he never reigned in Attica, never performed any memorable action, and was cotemporary with Jon. His name, therefore, could never be given to the country, but by poets.

Again, Herodotus, Lib. I. §. 56, says, the principal nations of Greece were, the Lacedemonians and Athenians; the one, among the Dorians, and the other, among the

Ionians; the one Pelasgic, the other Hellenic: the former never quitted the country it first settled in; the latter frequently did. And, §. 57, he says, “ the Pelasgi spoke a “ barbarian language; and, that being so, that it follows, “ that the Athenians, originally Pelasgi, forgot their own “ language, when they became Hellenes, and learned that “ of the Hellenes.” If this account be understood of those, whom Herodotus called Hellenes, it is evidently false: those, which he called Hellenes, were inhabitants of Phthiotis, in Thessaly; as he himself declares. Now these not only never conquered, but did not even attack, nor enter into Attica. How, then, in his sense, could the Pelasgi of Attica become Hellenes, and forget their own language? That the Pelasgic inhabitants of Attica did, however, become Hellenes, is true; but it was by mixing, and being incorporated with the Ionic Hellenes, as above stated. It is also plain, that these Ionic Hellenes were much more numerous than the Pelasgi, with whom they were incorporated; otherwise their language would not have prevailed: yet, both together could not amount to any considerable number; since, upwards of 180 years after the arrival of the Ionians, the joint population did not exceed 20,000.* Herodotus further adds, §. 58, that, in his opinion, the Hellenes always spoke the same language, from their very origin; and, that though they were, at first, few and weak, when considered apart from the Pelasgi,

* See the authors, quoted by Goguet, Vol. II. p. 20, English.

lasgi, they, afterwards, by incorporating several barbarian tribes, became as considerable as many other nations: and, that for this, among many other reasons, the Pelasgi, who were barbarians, never became considerable: probably, as Mr. l'Archer remarks, because they never adopted any other tribe. From this passage, I think, it may also be inferred, that the Hellenic or Greek language never received any improvement, from the time of the first Ionic descent.

A very learned and judicious translator of Herodotus thinks, that, if Attica had been originally possessed by the Pelasgi, it would have been called *Pelasgia*; as Peloponnesus had been. And, probably, it would, if the Pelasgi had been equally powerful there; and had retained the possession of it, as long as they did of Sicyon and Argos: but most of them had been expelled from Attica, in the earliest age to which history reaches. He thinks, also, that the Aones and Temnices were not Pelasgi: but, may not they have been Pelasgic tribes? Strabo tells us, there were many tribes of them, p. 921; and quotes Homer's 2^d Iliad, v. 840. And, are we not bound to think them Pelasgi, by the express testimony of Herodotus, uncontradicted by any ancient historian? The learned translator thinks Ogyges to have been king of the Aones and Temnices; and to have fled with them, into Bœotia, at the time of the flood, which bears his name, 7 l'Archer, 270. If so, he must have reigned in Attica, at the time that the Aones and Temnices possessed it; and, consequently,

quently, before the arrival of the Ionians in Attica. Yet, I am rather disposed to think, that he was an Ionian king; and that this Flood happened after the Ionian descent; for the Athenians celebrated the anniversary of that inundation for many centuries; as Plutarch informs us, in his *Life of Sylla*.^{*} Now, it does not appear likely, that they would commemorate an event, that happened in that country before they arrived in, and inhabited it. Nor would they claim a barbarian king, as Ogyges must have been, if he reigned only over the Aones and Temnices: for these are expressly called barbarians,[†] by Strabo, *Lib. IX.* 615. Nay, Africanus, in *Euseb. Prepar. Evang.* 488, expressly calls him a native Athenian, that is, Ionian.

I shall now continue to establish the Ionian origin of the Athenians particularly, and, generally, of all the Greeks; not denying, that several barbarian tribes were incorporated with them.

Strabo, *Lib. VIII.* 513, tells us, there were as many Grecian tribes as there were varieties of Greek dialects; and, that of these, the ancient Attic was the same as the Ionic: for, that the ancient inhabitants of Attica were called Ionians; from whom sprung the Ionians, who afterwards settled in Asia: and, that the Doric was the same as the Æolic. Now, let it not be said, the inhabitants of Attica were called Ionians, from Jon, the son of Xuthus;
as

^{*} Vol. IV. p. 148, English.

[†] That is, they spoke a different language from the Greek.

as Herodotus, who lived about 1000 years after this Jon, and most other subsequent heathen historians, were led to imagine; for such a compliment, as the adoption of a name, derived from that of an individual, was never paid but to kings, or the first settlers in a country. Now Jon, though general of the Athenian forces, never reigned over Attica;* nor is he mentioned in the list of Athenian kings, given by Pausanias, Attic. p. 7; nor in the more accurate series, collected by l'Archer, Vol. VII. p. 293. Foreigners seem to have been better acquainted with the origin of the Greeks. Thus, the Persian Queen, Atossa, calls all Greece, and not the Athenians in particular, *Ἰωνῶν γέν*, Æschylus, Persæ, v. 154. The old scholiast, on the Acarnenses of Aristophanes, says, that the Thracians, Bœotians, and Achæans, were called Ionians: and so does Hesychius, in voce *Ἰων*. For the Thracians, also, were, prior to their mixture with a multitude of barbarians, descendants from Jon or Javan, as already seen. Hence, the Athenians boasted, that their community was the most ancient of all the Greek communities; and, that they had never abandoned the territory in which they first settled, Herod. Lib. VII. §. 161: that is, they never voluntarily quitted it, nor were expelled by force. But they sent out several colonies; and were, for some time, expelled, by a natural convulsion.

* Conon, indeed, in Photius, p. 438, says, that Jon reigned in Attica: but he is contradicted by the whole series of events of Jon's life; and, at least, by implication, by all other historians.

sion. And, Lib. I. §. 143, he calls Athens an Ionian city. He adds, indeed, that the Athenians (in after times, namely, in that of Cyrus) were ashamed of being called Ionians. If this be true, it was, evidently, on account of the weak state of the Ionian colonies, in the reign of Cyrus: but Plutarch, in his treatise on the malignity of Herodotus, §. 21, absolutely denies it. It must, also, be remembered, that Herodotus was a Dorian; a tribe always jealous of the Athenians. He owns, that several, if not most of the Ionian colonies, gloried in that name.

We may date the arrival of the Ionians in Attica, from the reign of Ogyges, who was, probably, their leader, and began his reign 1796 years before the Christian æra, see 7 l'Archer's Herodotus; that is, 848 years after the confusion of languages, and the dispersion of mankind; 374 years after the commencement of the Pelasgic kingdom of Sicyon, under Ægialeus; 176 years after the commencement of another Pelasgic kingdom, in Argos, by Inachus. Thus, we see the Pelasgi, after their expulsion from Ionia, had sufficient time to spread themselves all over Greece, before the arrival of Ogyges. About thirty-seven years after his arrival, that is, about the year 1759 before Christ, he was obliged to quit Attica, by that great inundation, which still bears his name; occasioned, most probably, by the rupture of the isthmus, which separated the Black sea from the Mediterranean; whose efflux, and reaction, were felt on the shores of Asia Minor, and Attica. He, his subjects, and his neighbours, the Aones and Temnices,
fled

fled for refuge to Bœotia. This we may infer, (for I find no express proof of it,) from Bœotia having been anciently called Ogygia. And, as Ogyges had, in Attica, built the city of Eleusis, Euseb. Prepar. Evang. 489, so, in Bœotia, there were cities, called Athens, and Elusis, in the age of Cecrops, which were destroyed by a subsequent inundation, Strabo, 624, Pausan. 756: and, in Thebes, there was a gate called Ogygia, Pausan. 728. Now Philocorus, an ancient historian, who flourished in the reign of Antigonus, king of Macedonia, denies, that any king reigned in Attica, for 189 years after this deluge; and tells us, that it remained waste, until the reign of Cecrops, Euseb. Prepar. Evang. 490. Since, therefore, Ogyges survived this deluge, and did not reign after it in Attica, but left so many marks of his presence in Bœotia, it naturally follows, that he remained and reigned there, as long as he lived. That he survived the deluge, is affirmed by Eusebius, in his chronicle.

During the time that Ogyges reigned in Attica, and while he remained in Bœotia, and before the return of the greater part of his colony to the Athenian territory, that is, during 226 years, we may conclude, that many Ionian families settled in Locris and Phocis; as we find them in those regions after that interval.

Such, also, of the descendants of Jon, as settled in Epire, being pressed by the barbarians behind them, during this interval, passed into Acarnania and Etolia. Pliny expressly tells us, that Etolia was peopled by the Atha-

manes, Lib. IV. c. vii; and these, according to Strabo, p. 495, were Epirots. Thus, the Ionic language was introduced into the eastern and western regions of Greece without the isthmus.

Of the successors of Ogyges, in Bœotia, until the reign of Cecrops, an. 1582 before Christ,* we have no account. According to Strabo, p. 624, he reigned in Bœotia: and, as he led back the Athenians, or the greater part of them, into Attica, he is generally esteemed the first king of Athens. It has been said, indeed, that he married *Acte*, the daughter of Acteus, king of Athens, Pausan. 7; but this Philocorus affirms to be a fiction. Some say he was an Egyptian. It is highly probable, that he travelled into Egypt; but not that he was an Egyptian: for Euseb. Prepar. Evang. Lib. X. c. x, expressly says, he was a native Athenian; and so does Apollodorus, Lib. III. c. xiii. He was said to be of a double nature; probably, because he spoke both the Greek and Egyptian languages.

During his reign, two remarkable events occurred; namely, the conquest of Thessaly, by Deucalion, an. 1541; and the inundation, by which it was laid waste, an. 1529, commonly called Deucalion's Flood.

Deucalion was the son of Prometheus,† who was said to have come from Mount Caucasus; but, probably, rather from

* The dates, in the sequel, are to be understood of years preceding the Christian æra; and, generally, taken from l'Archer's edition of Herodotus, Vol. VII.

† Dionys. Halicar. p. 14.

from *Caucasium*, in the island of Chios; a port, mentioned by Herodotus, Lib. V. §. 53, and, consequently, an Ionian: for the Chians were admitted into the Ionian assemblies, as Pausanias attests, p. 532; though he admits, that he was ignorant of the reason. But Apollodorus, Lib. III. c. xiii. §. 6, expressly says, he was a native Athenian. It is certain, the name, *Prometheus*, was well known in Athens; for Codrus had a son, called Prometheus, Pausan. 528. Hence, it follows, that Deucalion was also an Athenian. He fled to Athens, during the flood, Parian Marbles, epoch 4, and, probably, remained there; for he died, and was buried there. Pausan. 43.

Thessaly was, when invaded by Deucalion, possessed by the Pelasgi, who came from Peloponnesus, an. 1727, conducted by Acheus, Phthius, and Pelasgus; from whom three districts of Thessaly were named, Dionys. Halicar. p. 14. These Deucalion expelled, an. 1541, at the head of an army, composed of Leleges, Curetes, and a multitude of the inhabitants of the foot of Parnassus. The *Curetes* were Etolians; so called from Curium, a city of Etolia, Strabo, 657, 692. The *Leleges*, Strabo deems a collection of various tribes of Leucadians and Bæotians, who settled in Locris, and joined Deucalion, p. 495, 496, and were afterwards called Locrians, Dionys. Halicar. 14. The inhabitants of the foot of Parnassus must have been Phocians. Hence, I conclude, that both Deucalion, and his army, were Ionians, and mostly Hellenes; and thus the Hellenic language supplanted the Pelasgic, in Thessaly.

Deucalion reigned over all Thessaly, and inhabited Cyne, a city of Locris, Strabo, 660, 651: he had two sons, Amphycion, and Hellen. Amphycion reigned over that part of Thessaly, that lay near Thermopylæ, Par. Marbles, and Pausan. 815; and Hellen, over that part called Phthiotis, Strabo, 587. Amphycion is celebrated for having formed a council, consisting of deputies from all the Grecian states or communities, existing in his time; that is, according to the Parian Marbles, an. 1521. These were, the

Ionians,	Phthiotæ,	} Pausan. 815.
Dolopes,	Dorians,	
*Thessalians,	Malienses,	
Ænians,	Phocians,	
Magnetes,	Locri Epicmenides,	

This account of the different states, represented in the Amphycionic council, is of much importance to our present enquiry; for by it we find,

1st, That the tribes therein mentioned, and they alone, formed the really Greek population, at that period; to the exclusion of the Peloponnesians, who were then Pelasgi or Danai; and of the Bœotians, who were Cadmeans.

2^{dly}, That the Athenians were then called *Ionians*; and, consequently, could not have been so called from Jon, the grandson of Hellen, (as Herodot. Lib. VIII. §. 44, and most of the Greek historians, imagined; not knowing the true reason of that denomination;) for Jon was not then

* From Thessaliotitis, a district of Thessaly. See l'Archer, 564.

then born. Yet, to this reasoning, many would, perhaps, object, that the Dorians are here mentioned; who, according to Strabo, 587, were so called, from Dorus, a son of Hellen; who, nevertheless, was not then born. But Strabo was mistaken; for Andro, an earlier historian, whom he quotes, p. 729, says, they anciently inhabited a district of Thessaly, called *Doris*; whence they came to Parnassus, where Dorus settled, and governed them: and hence they were called Dorians; not from him, but from the territory they inhabited, afterwards called Hestiotis.

3^{dly}, We may remark, that the Hellenes are not even mentioned, as forming a separate tribe from the rest; as Herodot. Lib. I. §. 56, asserts: for, if such a tribe then existed, it could not fail of being enumerated with the other tribes. He is, therefore, mistaken, in representing them as a distinct tribe, inhabiting Phthiotis, in the reign of Deucalion. In one sense, it is true, all the Greek tribes might, and probably were, even then, called Hellenes; as the greater part of them descended from Hellas, the son of Javan, as already mentioned. But of this Herodotus was ignorant:* as was also Thucydides, Lib. I. §. 3, who imagined the Hellenes derived their name from Hellen, the son of Deucalion: and also Pausan. 262, who thought all Greece was called *Hellas*, from an inconsiderable

* Yet, of this, the ancient Greeks seemed to have some suspicion; for, Canon informs us, some thought Helien to be a son of Jupiter Photius, 438; that is, a person of illustrious but unknown birth.

able district of that name; so called from Hellen, who built a city, to which it was annexed; but which was, soon after, deserted by Hellen himself, the inhabitants removing to Melitæa, Strabo, 660. Hence, no other reason, for comprehending all the Greeks, under the name of Hellenes, can be given but that which I have assigned.

Thucydides, Lib. I. §. 3, says, the Greeks were comprehended under no common denomination, even so late as the days of Homer. Yet, it is certain, that all the inhabitants of Greece, without the isthmus, were called Hellenes, before the Trojan war, or shortly after: for Homer, speaking of Ulysses, says, *whose fame was spread all over Hellas and Argos*, Odyss. Lib. I. v. 344. Here Peloponnesus, which was anciently called Argos, is distinguished from all the rest of Greece; and not merely from the inconsiderable territory of Hellas. It also appears, by the 2^d Iliad, v. 683, (831, English,) that the town of Hellas was re-peopled before the Trojan war: for Homer distinguishes the inhabitants of Hellas from those of Phthia,

And *Hellas*, blest
With female beauty far above the rest.

Strabo, also, p. 568, shews, that Hesiod, at least as ancient as Homer, comprehended all the Greeks, under the name Hellenes.

The Enians, Magnetes, Dolopes, and Malienses, were Thessalian tribes. See 8 l'Archer, under those names. The two first were afterwards called Eolians, Pausan. 508.

Hellen

Hellen had three sons, Eolus, his eldest, Dorus, and Xuthus; by whose migrations or conquests, or those of their posterity, the Greek language was propagated into Peloponnesus and Bœotia.

To Eolus, Hellen left that part of Thessaly, which he governed: to Dorus, he assigned a certain portion of his subjects, to form a new settlement: Xuthus, the youngest, passed into Attica, where he married Creusa, the daughter of Erectheus, king of Athens. Dorus led his people to the foot of Parnassus, and founded three cities, Conon in Photius, 438. Yet, Herodotus says, he reigned in that part of Thessaly, called Hæstiotis; but he probably meant, that Dorus reigned over the the people of that district; whom, according to Conon, he led to the foot of Parnassus. Now Parnassus is a mountain of Phocis. Thus his account may, in some measure, be reconciled with that of Conon; who expressly says, that Dorus led his colony out of the dominion of Hellen, and settled at the foot of Parnassus; and Strabo, 587, agrees with him. But both are mistaken, as I have already shewn, in thinking, that from Dorus they received the name of Dorians.

How the Greek language penetrated into Peloponnesus, and gradually supplanted the Pelasgic, I shall now shew.

Xuthus, the youngest son of Hellen, had two sons, Acheus and Jon. Acheus having committed an involuntary homicide, was obliged to fly from Attica, and took refuge in Laconia in Peloponnesus, Strabo, 588, about the year 1407. He there built four cities, Conon in Photius,

tius, 438. It is then plain, that he was accompanied or followed by a number of Athenians. The inhabitants, from him, were called Achæans; and the country, Achaia. Laconia was the most southern part of Peloponnesus; having the Laconic gulph on the south, Arcadia on the north, the Argolic gulph on the east, and Messenia on the west.

Shortly after, namely, in 1406, Attica, being over-stocked with inhabitants, Jon, the younger brother of Acheus, led a considerable colony of Athenians into that part of Peloponnesus, then called Egialea, which bordered on the Corinthian gulph; and, at that time, subject to a Pelasgic king, called Silinous. This prince, to avoid hostilities, gave him his daughter in marriage, and appointed him his heir. In effect, Jon succeeded him, established his colony, and called the country Ionia, Strabo, 588. Pausan. 522. An. 1404. Acheus, collecting his forces, from Egialea and Attica, passed into Thessaly, and recovered the share, which his father Xuthus should have possessed, Pausan. 521.

Eolus, the eldest son of Hellen, had several sons; one only of whom need here be mentioned, namely, Salmo-neus, who reigned in Thessaly, Diodor. 397, Apollodorus, Lib. I. cap. vii. §. 24. Being probably disturbed, by the invasion of Acheus, he passed, with a great number of Eolians, into Elis, in Peloponnesus; and possessed himself of a considerable part of it, on the banks of the river **Alpheus**, and built the city **Salmonca**, 1 Diodor. 312. He
was

was received there the more readily, as Elis was peopled from Etolia, and its first king, Ethiolus, was a son of a daughter of Deucalion, Pausan. 375.

Sicyon was, for many ages, governed by Pelasgic kings; but, after the death of Corax, Epopeus, a Thessalian, succeeded him. His son, Laomedon, married Pheno, daughter of Clytius, an Athenian; and also assumed an Athenian, called Sicyon, a grandson of Erectheus, king of Athens, as his partner in the kingdom, gave him his daughter in marriage, and named him his successor. From him, that territory, before called Egialea, was called Sicyon. After him, Janiscus, also an Athenian, reigned: thus the Hellenic language became predominant. Pausan. 124, 125.

About the year 1374, Archander and Arciteles, sons of Acheus, passed from Phthiotis to Argos, and married two daughters of Danaus the second, who then reigned at Argos: by them, in memory of their father, both Argos and Lacedemon were called Achaia. Pausan. 522.

Not long after, that is, about the year 1362, Pelops, a native of Sipyle, a town on the confines of Phrygia and Lydia, came, with large treasures, into Peloponnesus, Thucyd, Lib. I. cap. ix. hired a body of Achæans from Phthiotis; which, at that time, was also called Achaia. Strabo, 561. By marriage with Hippodamia, the daughter of Oenomaus, he became master of Pisa, in Elis; and afterwards of Olympia. Pausan. 376. 1 Diodor. 317. His son, Atreus, obtained the kingdom of Mycenæ; and his grandson,

Agamemnon, became still more considerable: thus the Hellenic language made a further progress.

Arcadia was originally peopled by the Pelasgi; and anciently called Pelasgia. Pausan. 598, 599. How the Hellenic language was introduced into it, does not clearly appear. It is certain, it was not by the introduction of strangers; for Pausan. 375, tells us, it was from its very origin, inhabited by the same people. It is probable then, since it certainly adopted that language, that, being a very small territory, and surrounded by people who spoke that language, its inhabitants gradually acquired it; as the people of Savoy did the French. Even if the account, given by some writers, of its conquest, by Arcas, the son of Orchomenus, were true; yet, as this event is said to have happened 1834 years before Christ; that is, forty-four years before the arrival of Ogyges, and, consequently, when the Pelasgic language was spoken all over Greece, the difficulty of explaining, how it was supplanted by the Greek, would still remain.

The Greek language was introduced into Bœotia, at a much later period than into any other part of Greece. After the return of Cecrops into Attica, the Aones, Hyantes, and other mixed barbarian tribes, remained in Bœotia, until the arrival of Cadmus, in 1549, with a Phœnician colony. After some resistance, he obtained the entire possession of that country, and called it Cadmeia. Strabo, 615. However, after the lapse of many years, the descendants of Hellen, as appears by Diodorus, obtained
a part

a part of it: for Eolus, the son of Hellen, had several sons, as already mentioned. One of them, called Mimas, remained in Eolis, and had a son, called Hippotes; whose son, Eolus the second, had a daughter, called Arne; and she had a son, called Beotus. This Beotus, with a number of Eolians, invaded Cadmeia, possessed himself of a part of it, and called it Bœotia. Diodor. 311. From these descended those Bœotians, who assisted the Greeks in the Trojan war. Diodor. 312. Thucyd. Lib. I. cap. xii. But the Phœnicians continued to occupy the greater part of Bœotia, until the war with the Epigoni, an. 1307, Strabo, 615; at the conclusion of which, Thebes was taken, the inhabitants forced to fly into Illyria, and an Argive colony settled there; who transferred the government to Thersander, the son of Polynices, by an Argive princess. Pausan. 722. At this time, and for upwards of a century after, the Ionic dialect, and no other, was spoken all over Greece. Pausan. 199, expressly tells us, that, before the return of the Heraclidæ to Peloponnesus, with an army of Dorians, the Argives spoke the same dialect as the Athenians; that is, until eighty years after the destruction of Troy. Thucyd. Lib. I. cap. xii. Now it is well known, that the ancient Attic dialect was the same as the Ionic. Strabo, 513.

Thus I have proved, that the primeval language was introduced into Greece, by the Ionians, who inhabited Attica; and shewn how, from them, it was extended to the different regions that composed it.

It were difficult, however, if not impossible, to conceive how an entire language, and, particularly, one so perfect as the Greek, could subsist, among a people so rude and unsettled as the early Greeks, and who had so little peaceful intercourse with each other, if not committed to writing, and preserved in books, composed long before their lapsing into a state so unfavourable to literature. And, accordingly, we do find, that such books existed in the earliest ages. Diodorus, Lib. V. p. 376, tells us, that several literary monuments existed in Greece, which were lost by a great inundation, probably, that of Ogyges, by which Attica was laid waste; and from which he fled, with precipitation, into Bœotia.* But many may have been saved; and, certainly, some existed, in the age of Cecrops: for Tacitus, Lib. XI. Annal. c. xiv. says, that many attributed the invention of letters to him; which could not be, if books did not exist in his time.† It appears, also, from Diodorus's account, that these literary monuments existed, at the time of the inundation, in Attica only; and not in those parts inhabited by the Pelasgi: for he tells us, that the Egyptians, claiming to themselves the invention of the astronomical science, the Greeks had nothing to reply. Now, as the inundation reached no other part of Greece but Attica, they could have replied, if any astronomical books had existed in the parts inhabited by the Pelasgi.

We

* Mount Helicon was a very proper place of refuge.

† If we credit Cedrenus, p. 81, Deucalion wrote a history of the flood; namely, that which happened in his time.

We have, also, strong reasons to presume, that the Ionians, on the continent, had books, previous to the arrival of Ogyges in Greece. Where else could those astronomical observations be made, or those treatises composed, which the inundation swept away? That the letters they used, were the most ancient known in Greece, appears by several testimonies. Tacitus tells us, *Annal. Lib. XI. c. xiv.* that the Latin letters were formed as were the most ancient letters in Greece; *formæ literis Latinis quæ veterimis Græcorum*: and, Pliny tells us, these forms were the Ionic; *gentium consensus tacitus primus omnium conspiravit, ut Ionum literis uterentur; veteres Græcas fuisse, easdem pæne quæ nunc Latinæ.* *Histor. Natur. Lib. VII. c. lvii. and lviii.*

Mr. Astle, than whom no man penetrated deeper into this subject, tells us, p. 56, of his treatise on the Origin of Writing, that, “after the Romans had established the use of the Ionic letters, they seem not to have acknowledged the Pelasgic and Etruscan to have been Greek alphabets. The most learned of them knew none older than the Ionic; as appears, by the Greek Farnese inscriptions of Herodes Atticus.* This learned man, out of a sacred regard to antiquity, caused the oldest orthography to be observed in the writing; and the letters to be delineated after the most antique forms that could be found; and they are, plainly, no other than the Ionic, or right-handed characters.” But we shall presently see, that the Pelasgic and Ionic letters were nearly the same.

It

* He was prefect of Asia, A. D. 97.

It has been long and very generally held, on the authority of Herodotus, Lib. V. §. 58, that the Greeks were unacquainted with letters, before the arrival of Cadmus, an. 1549; but Mr. l'Archer has well shewn, that the text of Herodotus, on which that opinion is principally founded, has been misunderstood; and that Herodotus does not say, that *letters* were brought into Greece by Cadmus, but only *some letters*, 4 l'Archer, 254. Cadmus introduced only three letters, *Zeta*, *Theta*, and *Chi*; which, for the facility of arithmetical calculation, (best understood by the Phœnicians, a commercial people,) were generally received.

Diodorus also, Lib. V. §. 57, says, that it was believed that Cadmus first brought letters into Greece: but, §. 74, he says, that the Phœnicians were not the inventors, but barely changed their form.

Many have also supposed, that the Pelasgic letters were the first known in Greece, and more ancient than the Ionic: but this is evidently a mistake; for Pliny, Lib. VII. cap. lvi. tells us, that the Pelasgi introduced letters into Latium. And, in the two following chapters, he tells us, that the Latin letters were nearly the same as the most ancient Greek, and were the Ionic: which is confirmed by Tacitus, and Herodes Atticus.

These Pelasgi were either those, who, according to Dionys. Halicarnass. Lib. I. §. 18, being expelled from Thesaly, by Deucalion, passed soon after into Italy, an. 1539; or those that followed Evander, from Arcadia, into Italy, an. 1330; or under Ænotrus, also from Arcadia, at a much earlier

earlier period, an. 1837. Dionys. Halicar. Lib. I. §. 11. However that may be, it is plain, the Pelasgic and Ionic were nearly the same.

Dionysius expressly says, the colony, conducted by Evander, brought letters into Italy, Lib. I. §. 31, 33; and this I think the most probable opinion.

The Pelasgi occupying, in the earliest ages, the greatest part of Greece, the letters they used, though the same as the Ionians also used, were more generally known under the name of Pelasgic. Hence it is, that Orpheus and Linus are said, by Diodorus, Lib. III. §. 66, p. 236, to have written their poems in Pelasgic letters. But he confounds the first Orpheus, who, according to Solinus, p. 718 and 719, lived eleven generations before the Trojan war; and, consequently, in the year before Christ 1633, with Orpheus, the Argonaut.

The elder Orpheus then wrote long before the arrival of Cadmus in Greece: for the proof of this I refer to Mr. Jackson, who, in the third volume of his Chronological Antiquities, p. 138, has treated this subject very fully.

Mr. l'Archer, also, in the fourth volume, p. 256, of his translation of Herodotus, has shewn, that the Pelasgic, and ancient Attic letters, were the same; though he acknowledges, that he is at a loss to account for their identity, or how they were introduced into Attica; not noticing the Ionic descent of the Athenians. Herodotus, Lib. V. §. 58, expressly tells us, that the Ionians of old had books, written on parchment, called *Dipththeræ*.

Lastly,

Lastly, the etymology of antediluvian names is as easily found in the Greek, as either in the Hebrew, Syriac, or Arabic; or even more easily. Thus, *Adam* is derived from *Αττα*, *pater*; *Eve*, (or rather Cheva, as Dathe has it,) from *Εχευα*, *peperi*; *Cain*, from *καινος*, *novus*, being a new man; *Abel*, from *Αβαλ*, *alas*; *Seth*, from *ζητω*, *quæro*, being sought for, in the room of Abel; *Noah*, from *Ναυς*, a ship. Tubal Cain I omit; as this name was given to a remote descendant of Cain, long after his banishment; and, consequently, when the primitive tongue was probably altered. *Babel*, from *Βαλβις*, a starting-post; as it was from thence all mankind set out, to settle in different countries. The Hebrew, which is said to contain the roots of many languages, did nothing more, than strip some primeval words of their terminations, and thus disfigured them.